DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
3NR1583C6D7

PUBLIC LIBRARY
APR 21 1956
DETROIT

0 Cents

April 25, 1956

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

What's Wrong with Nixon?

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

The Right to Nullify

FORREST DAVIS

The New Leader: Stalin

F. A. VOIGT

Articles and Reviews by . . . . . REVILO OLIVER

L. BRENT BOZELL · ROY CAMPBELL · WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

WILLMOORE KENDALL · EDWARD CASE · WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

#23

from WASHINGTON *straight*

A NEWSLETTER

SAM M. JONES

Congressional Pace

With the Democratic Convention less than four months away, the backlog of legislative business on the congressional agenda is attracting criticism of the "do-nothing Congress" variety. Actually, the situation is not so bad as it appears. In the first half of any session, most of the work is done in committee; an essential but often inconspicuous part of the business of lawmaking. The farm bill did not unduly delay action on other major legislation; but important measures still to come include several highly controversial proposals one or more of which might delay adjournment.

Foreign Aid

The biggest battle of the session may center on the Administration's request for $4,900,000,000 in foreign aid. Normal Democratic support will be diminished, and Republican opponents are prepared to wage a bitter fight against continued subsidies. Barring an unforeseen public rebellion, however, the White House will get congressional approval of a pared-down bill minus the ten-year commitment. Opposition leaders hope to save taxpayers over a billion.

Schools

More hearings at an unspecified date is the outlook for the School Construction Bill, stalled in the House Rules Committee since last July. The Senate will not act unless the House passes the bill. Its enactment in this Congress is unlikely.

S.S. Changes

The House-approved bill "liberalizing" Social Security has been held up in the Senate Finance Committee, but proponents expect it to go to the floor soon with a good chance of passage.

Highway Program

The Senate-approved multi-billion-dollar road bill, now before the House Public Works Committee, will probably reach the Floor late this month. It is expected to pass the House by a wide margin.

Tax Reduction?

The big issue between Congress and the Administration from now until adjournment may be the question of tax reduction. The temporarily silenced demand for a cut will surely be revived if the Treasury Department's tax-receipt estimate of last January turns out to be overly conservative. Despite Administration insistence that debt-reduction must come first, strong segments of both parties will unite in favor of a tax-cut in this election year.

States Rights

Interest in the "States Rights" Bill, sponsored by Rep. Howard W. Smith (D. Va.) has pyramided since the Supreme Court decision invalidating state laws on sedition. The Smith Bill, which has the support of thirteen senators (twelve from the South) and the Southern Regional Conference of Attorney Generals, is designed to restore the full sovereignty of the states. Rep. Smith termed the sedition decision "merely a symptom of a dangerous disease" which increases federal power at the expense of the states. His bill would protect states rights in matters of public welfare, transportation, labor law, navigation and some fields of criminal law.

Civil Rights

Prospects for agreement on a civil rights program are practically nil. Administration proposals are unlikely to be acceptable to Southern Democrats or to the majority leadership, despite the fact that Northern Democrats are working toward a similar program. Debate on this subject could well be the curtain-raiser on a split in the Democratic Convention—if and when a bill is reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, headed by Senator Eastland.

Case of No Bribe

Although the four-man, bipartisan special Senate Committee "severely censured" two agents of the Superior Oil Company for activities in behalf of the Natural Gas Bill, the investigators found no evidence to indicate bribery or an attempt to bribe. Senator Case (R. S. Dak.), whose sensitiveness regarding the offer of a $2,500 campaign contribution was responsible for the investigation, was neither commended nor condemned. Many of his colleagues felt, however, that legitimate campaign contributions may be fewer and slimmer this year because of "the Case incident."

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

James Burnham Willmoore Kendall
Suzanne La Follette
Jonathan Mitchell William S. Schlamm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES AND CONTRIBUTORS

L. Brent Bozell, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, Frank S. Meyer, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Morrie Ryskind, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke
London: F. A. Voigt *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ADVERTISING MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

CONTENTS

APRIL 25, 1956 VOL. I, NO. 23

THE WEEK 3

ARTICLES

The Right to Nullify ..... Forrest Davis 9
What's Wrong with Nixon? .... John Chamberlain 13

DEPARTMENTS

From Washington Straight ..... Sam M. Jones 2
The Liberal Line ..... Willmoore Kendall 8
National Trends ..... L. Brent Bozell 12
Foreign Trends ..... W. S. 15
Letter from London ..... F. A. Voigt 16
The Ivory Tower ..... Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. 17
Arts and Manners ..... William S. Schlamm 18
To the Editor 22

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Too Much and Too Soon ..... Revilo Oliver 19
Moral for Our Times ..... Russell Kirk 20
Big Brotherly Reference Book ..... Edward Case 20
No Smug Editorials ..... Roger Becket 21
Tauromachy ..... Roy Campbell 21

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly at Orange, Conn. by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1956 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37 St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES. Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign, $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

In Ceylon, a motley Popular Front of nationalists, religious extremists, official and Trotskyite Communists has defeated the able and courageous Sir John Kotelawala, who has been Prime Minister since 1953. Ceylon, lying off the tip of India, is in a strategic position to dominate the Bay of Bengal, Southeast Asia, and the great ocean highway of the Strait of Malacca. The new Prime Minister, Solomon West Ridgway Diaz Bandaranaike, under pressure from the left wing of his coalition, indicated that his first move will be: to push the British out of their two air bases and the station that their Fleet still maintains in the fine harbor of Trincomalee; to enter into diplomatic relations with Moscow and Peiping; and to begin steps to nationalize foreign-owned tea, rubber and cocoanut plantations. Undoubtedly the State Department will take the opportunity to launch a program of prodigious foreign aid to Ceylon.

The sound and fury that accompanied the veto of the Natural Gas Bill has fizzled out with the report of the special Senate Committee which was appointed to inquire into John Neff's attempted contribution to the campaign fund of Senator Francis Case. The Committee found "galloping irresponsibility"; convicted Mr. Neff of lobbying "in an inept fashion" (a conclusion that will not be disputed); and concluded in sum that "there was neither a bribe nor an attempt to bribe." In other words, the Committee sought, no doubt wisely, to push the whole matter out of political sight. It certainly offered no explanation for the President's veto of a bill that he had himself described as both just and expedient.

Oregon's Junior Senator made an impressive stab the other night at surpassing his Senior in irresponsible proposals—admittedly a difficult feat. Senator Neuberger advocated a measure whose logical outcome would be the dissolution of our federal form of government—or another War Between the States—in order to enforce, by bayonet if necessary, the Christian doctrine of "love thy neighbor." He suggested the creation of a federal police force not only to safeguard the right of Southern Negroes to vote and to receive equal education, but also to safeguard their "inalienable American rights . . . *to be respected* . . ."

On April 8 the Soviet Communist Party issued a ten-thousand-word "appeal to farm workers" that told

much more about the current state of Soviet agriculture than a library of official statistics. The appeal complained of the "inadequate expansion" of sugar beets, the failure of the corn harvest, the "backwardness" of meat production, the uneven yields of cotton, the "lowered" potato production. The phantom character of the propagandized increase in the Soviet standard of living is now openly admitted.

When a jet transport brought General Serov into London Airport, a chorus of headlines proclaimed that the plane was in mass production and that the Soviet Union was "five years ahead of the West" in jet development. It is now confirmed that the machine was one of exactly two prototypes. The model is not in production at all (much less mass production) and is apparently no good anyway. But, so far as we can see, Moscow is wasting money by having its own propaganda service. The Western press does the job better, and for free.

The End of Project Tito

Since 1948, when the Cominform split with Tito, agencies of the U.S. Government have given to Yugoslavia more than a billion dollars worth of economic and military aid. Great Britain, France, the International Bank and other UN auxiliaries have also donated or lent large sums.

This aid was "unconditioned." That is, no specific political, economic or military gurantees were obtained from Tito in return for it. The theory justifying this expenditure was that Tito's regime, having broken from Soviet control, would evolve away from Moscow and toward the West. The process would be speeded by "generous" Western behavior. Tito would become, more and more firmly, an ally of the West; and other captive nations would follow his pioneering and rewarding lead.

Let us assume that this theory was tenable as a hypothesis, and deserving of an experiment sufficient to test it fully. As an experiment it was very costly; but it would no doubt have been worth while if it had worked.

The Tito experiment is now, however, finished. Tito and Titoism have indeed evolved, but back to the Kremlin. Yugoslavia is once again an integrated part of the Soviet system. In the strategy of the world revolution it is assigned a role somewhat different but no less essential than that of the standard "captive nations" (Poland, Rumania, etc.): Yugoslavia is to act as a funnel into which Western goods, money, machines and armament can pour through the Iron Curtain, and as a will-o'-the-wisp to beckon Western leaders. Yugoslavia is no longer "balancing between East and West," no longer neutralist, no longer undecided. Yugoslavia is a unit in the Soviet machine for world conquest.

This conclusion has been proved during the past four months by two sets of facts.

First: on every major world issue Tito has taken a position identical to that of the Kremlin—on disarmament, China, Formosa, Quemoy and Matsu, Germany, the Middle East, North Africa.

Second: the one unambiguous application of the "anti-Stalin campaign" is to seal the reconciliation between Tito and Moscow. Tito greeted the 20th Congress of the Soviet Party and hailed its results. The Congress apologized to Tito, praised him, and began the attack on his dead opponent. To prove the seriousness of the new relation, the captive nations have one after the other gone through the almost incredible process of "rehabilitating" the men whom a few years ago they shot or imprisoned as Titoists: Rajk in Hungary, Kostov in Bulgaria, Gomulka in Poland, and a number of their less conspicuous colleagues.

The experiment is finished. And what is the conclusion?

That question we would like to put to the members of Congress, who have before them a foreign aid bill in which more millions of aid both economic and military are proposed for Tito.

Their vote will write the conclusion.

The Whole Hog

Citizens who have long favored an explicit constitutional limit to the treaty power have had doubts about the simplified version of the "Bricker Amendment" that has been introduced by Senator Dirksen at the current session of Congress. We published last week a letter from one of our readers who argued that this new version is toothless, and its appearance the result of a deal between Senator Bricker and the President (a "cynical betrayal of principle").

We have ourselves felt that the Dirksen single-sentence resolution does not say enough; and we have urged an additional clause stating, in language which even the Supreme Court could not misconstrue, the principle that actions of continuing international bodies (such as the UN) do not of themselves have the force of law in the United States. But we have also believed that, if the simplified Dirksen formulation has the best and perhaps sole chance of adoption, then it deserves practical support.

We are strengthened in this judgment by the heavy attack that—quite suddenly—was launched against the new version. It began when the Liberal columnist, Roscoe Drummond, announced in the tone of a White House leak that the President would never accept the Dirksen resolution. It reached a high point

in a lead editorial published by the *New York Herald Tribune,* which has lately fancied itself as the voice of authentic Republicanism, which it interprets to mean abject Eisenhowerism. The *Herald Tribune* rejects any form of any treaty-limiting amendment under any circumstances. "This is no time to throw roadblocks in the path of international cooperation . . . The treaty-making power must be retained in full vigor." By "full vigor" the Eisenhowerites must mean (since this is what is involved in the wording of the amendment): unrestrained by the rest of the Constitution or the several provisions thereof.

The Court's Pleasure

In the past two weeks, the Supreme Court has ruled 1) that a state may not pass anti-subversive legislation, nor 2) municipalities laws requiring the summary dismissal of employees who invoke the Fifth Amendment when questioned about matters relating to their official conduct. The first (Steve Nelson) decision was reached not by reasoning but by sheer assertion: It is, the Court held, inherently the prerogative of the federal government to police subversives; besides, state anti-subversive laws interfere with the operation of federal laws, and hence are, on top of everything else, pragmatically a nuisance. (This in the teeth of an *amicus curiae* brief filed by the Justice Department asserting the contrary!) The decision invalidated laws in 41 states, and brought chaos in those states where conviction had resulted from prosecution under local laws.

In the case of Professor Harry Slochower of Brooklyn College, who in 1952 refused to answer questions pertaining to his relationship with the Communist Party in 1941, the Supreme Court reasoned (5-4) as follows: It is wrong to assume that a man who invokes the Fifth Amendment does so in order to hide guilt; it is even wrong to assume that he does so for selfish reasons. Under the circumstances, punitive administrative action based exclusively on such an assumption is arbitrary; and hence (accepting Justice Cardozo's equation of due process and "protection of the individual from arbitrary action") unconstitutional in that it violates the Fourteenth Amendment.

Once again, we find the Court guilty of irresponsible interference with local authority. The first decision, in that it bore on matters of jurisdiction rather than constitutionality, can itself be set aside by Congress, which will almost surely act to restore to the 48 states the right (subject, of course, to the Constitution) to protect themselves, in their own fashion, from revolutionaries.

But the Slochower decision is beyond the power of Congress to undo; it bears the closest examination.

". . . we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the Fifth Amendment . . .The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury."
—Slochower v. New York, 1956

". . . Men with honest motives and purposes do not remain silent when their honor is assailed . . . Is a court compelled to close its eyes to these circumstances? . . . These gentlemen have the right to remain silent, to evade, to refuse to furnish information, and thus to defy the government to prove its case; but a court of equity has the right to draw reasonable and proper inferences from all the circumstances in the case."
—U.S. v. Mammoth Oil Co. (the Teapot Dome case)

Granted one can conceive of a situation in which a man might for understandable and even honorable reasons invoke the Fifth Amendment. A case can, accordingly, be made against a law requiring the *summary* discharge of everyone who invokes it. (Perhaps, the argument would go, a hearing of sorts should be specified, at which the employee in question has the opportunity to point out the peculiar set of circumstances that prompted him to withhold cooperation.) But it is not the function of the Supreme Court to pass on the wisdom of a law, or on the adequacy of procedure followed under a law, unless that law or procedure violates the Constitution. And the suggestion that dismissal from office is in itself equivalent to the deprival of property is sophistical and can lead to far-reaching mischief.

Mr. Dooley wrote that "The Constitution iv the United States is applicable only in those cases where it applies on account iv its applicability." Slowly but surely *everything* is being interpreted as applying to the Constitution—on account of its applicability; for literally no other reason.

Trapped

From the moment they arrived in this country (in October 1955), nine Russian seamen who defected from Communism appeared happy with life in a free society. Yet on April 7, five of the nine suddenly flew back to the Soviet Union, under escort of two Soviet diplomats.

What pressures, lures, threats or promises were used to force such a dramatic reversal we cannot know. On leaving the United States, the redefectors were represented before U.S. Immigration authorities

only by Soviet counsel. Representatives of the International Rescue Committee, who had helped feed, clothe and find jobs for the seamen, and had presumably won their confidence in six months of intimate contact, were barred from the scene.

U.S. Immigration authorities cannot prevent men from going back into slavery. But the U.S. should at the very least insist that, before leaving the country, suicide-bent redefectors be interviewed in private, and at length, by men whose experience with Communism equips them to break the spell of blackmail and blandishment woven by Soviet officials.

Knowing Praise

Once again we are indebted to Mr. Richard Rovere for some direct language, which cuts through much current cant on the Welfare State as an issue in American politics. What follows appeared in the *Spectator*, published in London, for which Mr. Rovere writes regularly, and with stars in his eyes as he surveys America's Coming of Age:

"It would be a bit too glib, perhaps, to say that the Welfare State has . . . won its final, irreversible victory in this country, but a case can certainly be made to this effect. In his State of the Union message and in the budget he is proposing for the coming fiscal year, which begins on July 1, the President has committed himself and his party to government intervention in almost every area in which New Dealers and Fair Dealers have held it to be desirable . . . If a proper discount is allowed for the abnormalities of the period (during the Korean War) the cost of government under the Republicans can be made to appear as high or higher than the cost of government under the spendthrift Democrats . . . The fact [is] . . . that the Republicans have pretty well abandoned the economy drive that was to so many of them a political *raison d'être* . . .

" 'The dimensions of government responsibility are as broad as the farm problem itself,' the President said in his State of the Union message . . . The President can't really believe that; as a matter of fact, there is really nothing there to believe, and one imagines that the presence of such a sentence in the message is more than anything else testimony to the deadening of our responses to words. A few years ago the man who said this would have been put down as a Socialist, and not a 'creeping' one, either; it would have been unthinkable for a Republican—even a farm-state Republican caught in the act of voting crop subsidies—to express himself in this way. But the President's message was shot through with sentiments of this sort, and it is not the only piece of Republican oratory in which they can be found. The Administration wants to enlarge the federal role in education, in road-building, in housing, in medicine and public health, and in half a dozen other things. It makes no apologies for wishing to spend four billion dollars more at the end of its first four years than at the beginning—or nine billion more than in the proud year when it succeeded in paring its requests to the breathtakingly low figure of fifty-seven billion. It has made its peace with the Welfare State and the twentieth century. Whether this is good or bad depends, as the politicians say, on how you look at it."

It depends, as NATIONAL REVIEW would say, on how highly you value freedom.

Talkers Anonymous

With the patience of Job, Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson recently entered his ninth month of steady talks with the Chinese Communists in Geneva. His plight has touched the heart of one of our readers (Mrs. M. W. L. of North Hollywood) who wants to do something about it. She suggests the formation of an *American Association of Volunteer Talkers* (AAVT, or VT, for short). It would work this way, Mrs. M.W.L. says:

"On a rotation basis—say one family per week per given 'talk'—we could all take turns relieving Mr. Johnson and the thousands of other experts doing the same job all over the world. Just think what a fresh team each week—with children—would mean!

If we adults ran out of diplomatic double-talk what a golden opportunity for our young ones. No one seems to mind *what* is said—just so the 'talking' doesn't stop. No one would expect us VT's to be suave like real diplomats, so we could probably go for years without throwing one international cocktail party to show our 'friends' we aren't really mad at our 'enemies.' If we bring our own spending money, type our own reports, travel on ordinary luxury liners and 'talk' for free, we ought to save enough in a few months for Stassen to take on a few more underprivileged countries. As the AAVT program got rolling one big problem would be solved—we would *all* be imbued with the Geneva spirit and glad to do our share toward 'easing world tensions.'

"Once our world leaders appreciate what the AAVT's can do in keeping 'old tensions' at a steady 'talking' point, they can pioneer new 'tensions' at their leisure. Judging by the record so far this should assure every VT family all the world travel it wants —until interplanetary 'tensions' are ready for us."

Athletic Dialectic

American hopes of winning the Summer Olympics in Melbourne were pretty well knocked in the head by the brilliant Russian showing at Cortina. The Soviet Union has evidently decided that it is important to dominate the West even in the field of sports, and with its usual monolithic and humorless determination it started more than four years ago to grind out, on the lathe of the huge Soviet machine, the athletes it needed. The skiers, skaters, and bobsled teams the Soviet Union entered in the Cortina games were all highly trained professionals—as will be the track and field stars the USSR sends to Melbourne this summer. Ours, by contrast, are amateurs.

Under the circumstances, we can expect to lose in Melbourne this summer. And we are almost a sure thing to slip even farther behind the Soviet Union in 1960 when the relatively new Russian Olympic program will have really hit its stride. That's when, predictably, the pressure will be on our government: to move in and help out the struggling U.S. Olympic committee with more money, better paid coaches, finer equipment, etc.

This may be the only way we can beat the Russians at future Olympic games. But this is beside the point. To send our government-issue professionals against the Communists' government-issue professionals would prove nothing. It would finally pervert the spirit of the Olympic games and turn them into a mere extension of the East-West propaganda war. If we cannot support our teams on a voluntary basis, and if we find that the performance of our best amateurs does not satisfy the national pride, then we should simply withdraw from the Olympic games—or insist that the Communists be excluded, as professionals.

The People on Taxation

The soaking of the rich is not, it seems, by any means so passionate an objective of the people as it is of professional friends of the people. Whenever the subject of across-the-board tax reduction comes up, up goes the howl that the rich are being made richer at the expense of the poor. But, according to the Gallup Poll, this howl does not come from the people.

Dr. Gallup has asked a cross-section of Americans what taxes they would impose if they were members of Congress. Generally speaking, they agree that the rate of assessment on the lower levels is about right. But they recommend far milder tax rates than those in operation for the higher income brackets. For instance: a family of four now pays a federal income tax of $18,000 on an annual income of $50,000. According to the Gallup questionnaire, the general public would, on such an income, levy $7,000—or approximately 37 per cent of what the government now demands. The poll seems to indicate either a) that the average American has no idea how large is the tax burden on the wealthy, or b) that he consciously opposes the present steeply graduated—and, after a point, unabashedly confiscatory—tax rate. The poll may encourage those who are pressing for a constitutional amendment to put a 25 per cent ceiling on federal income taxes (see "A Limit on Income Tax," March 28).

Picking the Candidates

The Democratic Convention should be a lively affair if our own "Pick the Candidates" contestants are any judges. So far, they have offered us nineteen Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates and twenty-two different slates. Adlai Stevenson, for instance, is offered as a running-mate Sparkman, Symington, Lausche, Smathers, Herter, Kefauver and Clements. But the most popular slate seems to be Symington-Lausche, with a soaring 9 per cent of the total vote.

On the Republican side it is, so far, a 90 per cent sweep for an Eisenhower-Nixon ticket. (One Missouri maverick who suggested Knowland-Jenner apparently gave up in discouragement half way through the contest.) These predictions, we hurry to add, do not express our readers' (or the editors') preference but, rather, their guess as to who will make out.

We shall report soon again. There is plenty of time to get in on the act. Consult the cover.

The Liberal Line...

WILLMOORE KENDALL

A Paradoxical Estimate of Soviet Strength

The Liberal propaganda machine in recent weeks went right on

—urging a defeatist line on foreign affairs;

—exaggerating Communist strength, particularly Communist economic strength;

—underestimating the Communist threat to American security and survival;

—blaming our "plight" vis-à-vis the Communists upon our refusal to listen to the Liberals.

—urging a defeatist line on foreign affairs. The typical expression of this theme has been the insistence that we are losing, or are about to lose, or are beginning to lose, the cold war. Max Ascoli perfectly captures the machine's current mood on this topic in the title — "And They Say We Are Doing Fine" — of his lead editorial in the most recent issue of the *Reporter.*

—exaggerating Communist strength, especially Communist economic strength. This is being done to such an extent that the proposition, "The Soviet Union is stronger than it is," may now be considered a basic theme in the Liberal line. As Ascoli put it in the editorial just mentioned: ". . . the Communist bloc . . . has become more articulate, more relaxed, for the Communist leaders draw full advantage from *the enormous productive machine they are mastering.* They can *now rival us in the manufacture both of weapons and of marketable goods* . . . Actually, *there is no field in which these pedantic imitators have not caught up with us* and are not *competing with us.*" (Italics mine.)

—underestimating the Communist threat to our security and survival. We cannot, to be sure, speak of the proposition, "The Soviet Union is less dangerous than it is," as a theme of the Liberal line, or nail the point down with another quote from the *Reporter.* But the machine gets the idea across all the same (as does the Ascoli editorial we have our eye on) — by indirection. It doesn't haul out into the open and discuss questions regarding the nature and extent of the harm that Communist strength might (failing appropriate action on our part) inflict upon the United States. Thus while the machine never ceases to insist that we must meet and cope with the Soviet economic aid "offensive," and that we must keep abreast and even a little ahead of the USSR in weapons development, the precise reasons *why* we must do so are never put into words; they are left for the machine's readers and listeners to supply for themselves. And they can, of course, be counted on to supply the most optimistic view of the future consistent with the facts the machine places at their disposal. (The picture the machine holds out to them, to the extent that it holds one out at all, suggests the continuance of present forms of competition into an indefinite and, one gathers, uneventful future — with nobody, neither We nor They, getting hurt much. The recent proposal for a foreign aid program covering 100 years is exactly the sort of thing Liberal hints about the future point to.)

—blaming our "plight" vis-à-vis the Communists on, for the most part, our failure to listen to the Liberals. We are not carrying out their program for a "free world." Here we *can* get further help from the Ascoli editorial, whose key paragraphs discuss that program under the general heading of "integration" — and fairly make the top spin:

"In what is called the free world," he writes, "the champion and advocate of integration used to be the United States. The verbiage of integration is still a standard part of the rhetorical equipment of our government. . . .But when it comes to giving an example of America's participation in a broader whole, . . . then the tendency of the American government is to have our nation included out."

Having our nation included out is, moreover, costing us dearly: "[We do not practice what we preach] and therefore our influence is constantly decaying . . . During the war we used to be the leaven of the Grand Alliance . . . [We] provided the leaven to the restoration and new growth of the European economies. . . [We] gave weapons and leadership to the NATO alliance. Now, we have reached a stage where neither military alliances nor economic assistance are enough."

Why are they not enough? Well, partly because of recent policy changes in the USSR; partly because of the "unchanging nature of the Communist bloc." Mostly, however, because the Kennan days are a little bit over — because we have not remained wholly faithful, that is to say, to the Liberal blueprint for a world empire that can counteract — not defeat, mind you, but counteract — the Communist empire. And nothing *short* of that blueprint will do:

"Our nation is not nearly strong and powerful enough to counteract alone the Communist bloc, and . . . by no stretch of the imagination can we bring into existence a bloc of nations whose massive unity can even remotely be a match for the Communist one. We have no way out except by giving both our leadership and our example for the process of integration — a process which implies *limited subordination of national sovereignties in order to make those sovereignties more secure,* and gradual coming into existence of *different commonwealths with different degrees of internal cohesion.* But there can be no process of integration started or restarted without the *propulsion of a major integrating power,* and *there can be no other integrating power than the United States.*"

Meanwhile Mr. Ascoli, like Mr. Bowles as we saw him in this space a few weeks ago, is sure that our major mistake, for the simple reason that it was our major departure from the Liberal blueprint, is that of relying too heavily on *military* strength:

"[The Soviet leaders] have no particular reason to worry about the policies of our leaders, particularly since these policies are aimed at fostering military coalitions *that are never in danger of growing into free and cohesive commonwealths.*"

The Right to Nullify

The former Washington editor of the 'Saturday Evening Post' and present Washington editor of the 'Cincinnati Enquirer' discusses the ordeals of desegregation

FORREST DAVIS

The magisterial Walter George (D., Ga.), Nestor of the Senate, scarcely had finished intoning the Manifesto of the one hundred Southern statesmen when Wayne L. Morse arose to place the scene and the quarrel in historic perspective. Senator Morse (D., Ore.), voluble and articulate, who turned his coat during his present term for reasons having little to do with major controversies, professed to find the shade of John C. Calhoun "walking and speaking on the floor" in the person of Senator George.

Morse's recollection was apt.

The South, from Virginia to Louisiana and Arkansas, again is locked, as in the nullification struggle of 1832, with the federal power. In Calhoun's day, the antagonist of South Carolina and, by extension, the South was an irascible President, Andrew Jackson, intent upon upholding the authority of the central government. The issue was the same as today: states rights.

A component of that issue, the asserted right of states to secede, was resolved at Appomatox; but the question of divided powers carried through the dispute over the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. Quite obviously the issue still is regarded as moot and arguable in the wash of the school decision. Calhoun won his argument with Jackson without putting to a court test the privilege of a state to nullify acts of the Congress. Henry Clay (Harry of the West) and the austere Calhoun pooled their strength to procure a tariff for revenue acceptable to South Carolina, which state in turn repealed its Ordinance of Nullification. Nullification, if not under that name, won again in 1933 when the country rid itself of the prohibition amendment.

The prospects for easy nullification of the Supreme Court's school edict are by no means, as the situation appears in the fore part of 1956, promising. In 1832-'33, the conflict was tempered by congressional compromise, the give and take, the convolutions and ambitions of strong-willed partisans. Before national prohibition went by the board, the Republic had experienced disillusionment and chagrin over what Herbert Hoover dubbed an experiment "noble in purpose."

In the school case the Supreme Court's writ runs, august and solitary, uncomplicated by congressional intervention, primarily dependent for enforcement on district and appellate courts with their power to punish for contempt, and unresponsive to the hostilities of the communities most deeply affected. While the edict will have existed for two years at the end of May, experience has not accumulated sufficiently (as it had in the matter of Volsteadism) to create an adverse national sentiment in which nullification might thrive.

Washington vs. *the Deep South*

In large part, experience is lacking because the Deep South has not heeded the Supreme Court. The City of Washington, to use its sonorous and honorific nineteenth-century name, has, by hastening integration, created an educational crisis disturbing to parents and educators. In Washington, where two-thirds of the school population is colored, integration has brought about an accelerated flight to the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, where Caucasians predominate, and an overcrowding in private primary and secondary schools.

Yet Washington is not typical of the rural South, and partisans of integration plead, with considerable justice, that the welding of children from widely contrasted environmental backgrounds into one school system is not far enough advanced to afford a conclusive judgment. The dilemma of the Southern Black Belts, confronted by the Court's sweeping reversal of the congenial "separate but equal" doctrine, is infinitely more complex.

Hence, the South, its governors, legislatures and Citizens' Councils, is striving to find a way around the Court's finding "by," in the language of the Manifesto, "any lawful means." The problem is not one of intent or will but of means. What that comes down to is nullification short of open resistance.

But how nullify? Behind the Court stands the Presidency, committed to enforcing the Constitution's provisions, whether spelled out in the original, or in the amendments, or as construed by the Court. Mr. Eisenhower, thoughtfully reminding the country that what is now law was *not* law just the other day, is in a patient and conciliatory mood. So far he stands wholly unmoved by the stridencies of anti-segregationists who would send the Army into Virginia and Georgia to compel integration at the point of the bayonet.

Tempers are, however, rising in Montgomery, Alabama, and in Harlem and in the salons and consistories of Manhattan. And the President's power to quell disobedience to the Constitution is inherent in his office, however temperately he may care to apply it. Open defiance of the Court's legislative fiat might well produce pressures from the North and West, which, accustomed to non-segregated schools and fairly indifferent to the issues involved, are at the moment willing to allow wide latitude to the contending parties.

What recourse, suitable to the Manifesto's "lawful" prescription, is open to the dissenting states?

The Southern legislatures have been busily invoking the doctrine of interposition this past winter. In brief, that doctrine declares the right of the states to interpose their sovereign

authority between federal measures (whether arising by amendment, by interpretation or legislation) and their citizens. A number of states have sought to interpose contrary to the federal authority. Kentucky once so acted on the advice of Thomas Jefferson. Virginia meditated interposition. Massachusetts and Wisconsin likewise have asserted the right. None of these ventures reached to the Supreme Court.

More recently, New Jersey and Rhode Island, although they did not rely on the doctrine, tested the right of states to repudiate federal enactment over prohibition. The Supreme Court held against them. Given the attitude of the present Court, there seems no likelihood that interposition would be sanctioned upon its inevitable appeal.

Virginia's Plausible Compromise

In an atmosphere thick with threats to abandon public school systems rather than submit to the Court and irresponsible rumblings of forcible resistance, Virginia has produced in the Gray Plan a plausible compromise. Last January, after a campaign unmatched in virulence since the debate over secession, the Old Dominion approved a constitutional amendment (300,000 to 145,000) enabling the state to provide free instruction in segregated or mixed schools. Quite simply, the Gray Plan put the tax monies available for public education at the disposal of parents rather than the existing dual school systems. It retained the principle of public schools (which was enjoined upon the state when it was readmitted to the Union and imbedded in the constitution of 1869).

Where mixed public schools existed, the parent, whether Caucasian or colored, could claim a per-pupil share of educational funds to defray tuition costs in a private, non-sectarian school. So it was done for students under the GI Bill of Rights educational program. The student elected his school, the money came from public funds. So, too, Virginia has for many years paid for the advanced schooling of gifted Negroes in Northern universities and for the blind and otherwise disabled children of school age in specialized institutions.

The Gray Plan provides more than an ingenious device with which to nullify the Court's blanketing order. It promises, on its face, a provocative experiment in selective education as opposed to the quasi-monopolistic position of the public schools, especially in the South. If the Gray Plan worked, it would afford a sizable yardstick by which to measure the utility of the public school. It could diversify the training of the young within a state. It might be used to develop separate schools for advanced pupils.

The Gray Plan remains, however, in the theoretical stage. It requires legislative specifications which are not forthcoming. Virginia's legislature adjourned for 1956 the other day without effectualizing the plan, and the governor announcedly has no intention of calling a special session.

Like the King of France, Virginia "went up the hill" in January and "came down the hill" in March. Why has that Commonwealth, so overwhelmingly committed to segregation by popular vote, backed away at least temporarily from the solution that seemed so feasible to its electioneering advocates? The problem has grown in difficulty. There is, for one thing, the wide variety in local preference. In the large dormitory communities across the Potomac from Washington, where suburbanites come from all parts of the Union and Negroes are relatively few, integration finds largely nominal resistance. Arlington County, for example, already has opted for integration. The same may be true in the prevailingly Caucasian Shenandoah valley and stretches of the Piedmont.

It is in Southside and coastal Virginia that the situation is acute. There, in a number of counties, the Negro school population outnumbers the white. It is here that the legislative leaders at Richmond found the stumbling block of the school plant.

In many Virginia small cities and towns, as elsewhere in the country, the people have built civic pride into high schools. Many have become community centers with auditoriums for plays and meetings, and athletic fields. These schools, it goes without saying, have been exclusively for teaching white adolescents. It is agreed that these plants cannot be used by private, segregated schools. That means that the high schools will be integrated, with, in many cases, Negro children overwhelming the white. And so the white community, unless it suddenly violated its centuries-old traditions, would find itself deprived of its community center while still, no doubt, paying off the bonds that financed it.

A multiplicity of other inhibiting factors vex the Virginia compromise. Virginia's experience likewise illuminates the ramifications of the problem which the Court undertook to dispose of in its obiter dictum. Although the South seeks to frame its nullification on state-wide lines, the question breaks down into communities and localities. Baltimore and Western Maryland, for example, are not averse to integration, Baltimore having already taken that step. Tobacco-growing Southern Maryland prefers segregation.

It is precisely into counties of dense Negro population, where integration is most deeply feared and resented, that the unresting legal staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People strikes with its court actions.

The Court, we may be sure, believed that by embracing the whole country within its *Diktat* it was redressing a wrong done to a nationwide minority. What it actually did was to create many local minority situations, with the minorities in these localities whites.

The NAACP's course is clearly charted by the courts: it need only sue out writs in federal courts demanding compliance. What paths lie open to the segregationists if interposition is held of no avail and compromises such as the Gray Plan fail in practicality? There remains the political pressure which a united South might bring on the party of its inheritance. A united South might, by holding its strength in suspense until after the August nominating conventions, insure the election of one candidate, and thus presumably gain friendly audience with the next Administration.

In the intensely political border city of Washington, such considerations naturally occur. In Washington, which has been the arena of the historic struggle between the states and the central government, the issues raised by the Supreme Court seem wider than whether white and Negro children shall be mingled in the public schools of the Deep South. Without

minimizing the impulses that obviously moved the Court, or the desire of Negroes to acquire the social status implied by integration, it should be borne in mind that the Court's decision makes it part and parcel of the long controversy concerning the metes and bounds of federal power over the local concerns of the citizen.

A Supreme Court statement of policy, however deserving of respect, is not necessarily the last word. Supreme Court decisions are neither as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians nor as harsh as the code of Hammurabi. Only those partisans satisfied with a judgment, and who therefore wish it closed, seek to exempt the Court from the public review and the dissent properly visited upon any political agency in a self-governing society.

A seamless view of our history supposes that great controversies once settled are settled for keeps. Yet the Court itself has frequently been overruled and has overruled itself. Had Mr. Eisenhower seen fit to sign the natural gas bill, the effect would have been to set the Court's will at naught. In the school finding, the Court reversed the precedents of three generations.

The Court has been a frequent storm center since Chief Justice John Marshall successfully asserted as its highest mission the interpretation of public acts in the light of the Constitution. Quite often the Court has been accused of usurpation. A half century ago, Woodrow Wilson, whose academic field was American history, warned the Court against meddling in "moral and social questions originally left to the states"; especially "paternal morals" which do not correspond to "local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience." Mr. Wilson, then president of Princeton, was lecturing at Columbia University. This was in calm 1907, but he drove the point home with a pertinence almost prophetic, saying:

> A deliberate adding to the power of the federal government by sheer judicial authority, because the Supreme Court can no longer be withstood or contradicted in the states, both saps the legal morality upon which a sound constitutional system must rest and deprives the federal structure as a whole of that vitality which has given the Supreme Court itself its increase of power.

In his *History of the American People,* as in other historical and polemical utterances, Mr. Wilson held that the division of powers among the branches of the federal government, and the reservation of powers not enumerated to the federal government by the Constitution, were cornerstones of our liberties. (Daniel Webster, in his memorable debate with Calhoun on the "force bills" sought by Jackson to bend South Carolina to the national will, held an opposite opinion. Webster denied that the Union owed its existence to the consent and agreement of sovereign states. So the great debate was joined.)

Mr. Wilson appealed against the Court on the grounds of "legal morality." His reference might as well be called political morality as opposed to the sociological morality with which the Court clothed the school ruling. In truth, the Court's reasoning derived more from the levelling doctrines of the Jacobins of the French Revolution than from the philosophy of the Founding Fathers.

The Question of Equality

Political slogans aside, the Fathers never conceived of the federal government as an agency empowered to make all Americans equal, uniform, or total abstainers. Nor is it relevant to suppose, as have some segregationists, that the Court was responsive to Marxist or Communist presumptions. Twentieth century Socialism, in practice in the Soviet Union, or its spawns, Nazism and Facism, characteristically has developed into hierarchic societies with elites and untouchables. In Soviet Russia the bourgeoisie, in Nazi Germany the non-Aryans were declassed and denied many privileges, including more often than not the privilege of living.

True egalitarianism, as has often been remarked, is a concept translated from the religious teaching that all men are brothers under God. Few, if any, political systems have practiced egalitarianism, and even to the Marxist the classless society is Utopian, receding ever further into the future.

The political South, feeling itself aggrieved, has substantial precedents for condemning the school decision as an infringement of state and local rights never ceded to the federal government. It has a right, as in the Manifesto, to agitate for that view. It has, moreover, substantial warrant for seeking to nullify the decision short of rebellion. Calhoun fixed nullification in our tradition, and there have been subsequent occasions when nullification was regarded not only as a means of remedying wrongs but as an active political good.

Thus, Dr. Arthur Twining Hadley, president emeritus of Yale University, writing in *Harper's* about law enforcement under the Eighteenth Amendment in 1925, hailed nullification "as the safety valve which helps a self-governing community avoid the alternative between tyranny and revolution." Dr. Hadley added:

"The cost of trying to compel obedience to a law which violates the consciences of a considerable minority . . . or the traditional usages and privileges of anything like a majority is usually too great." Dr. Hadley quite obviously was advocating passive resistance to a constitutional amendment and its enabling acts.

The voice of nullification was loud in the land in the 1920s, as it is now. That broad historic path is open to the Deep South although the methods by which it can retard or evade execution of the Court's decree are not at this moment visible. The South, feeling the weight of the federal power, is frustrated. Committed against open disobedience, it perhaps has an equal right with Calhoun in 1832 and Hadley in 1925 to advocate nullification. The South has a right to agitate, a right which the nation should recognize in the hope that frustration does not degenerate into a hopeless resort to violence.

Bayonets and riots are equally out of place in solving a great social question, upon which men of good will honestly differ, in an orderly society. The Supreme Court, it is true, is the court of last resort; but ultimately its judgments, too, must have the sanction of public opinion in this free, organic and fluid Republic. The question is not so much whether children of African and children of European stock shall study in the same classrooms. It is rather whether they shall be compelled to do so by an arm of the federal government. The issue devolves, as it has so often in the past, on where the rights and prerogatives of the central authority leave off and the rights of the citizen begin.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

It's Hot in Ceylon

The day after Ceylon's emphatic repudiation of Sir John Kotelawala's pro-Western government, the *New York Times* predicted the election news would be received "glumly" in Washington. That was to put it mildly; the Ceylon upheaval impaled the Administration on the horns of a major policy dilemma from which it cannot conceivably extricate itself unbloodied. The State Department, the ICA, and others concerned with the U. S. foreign aid program, are discovering that the wages of unsuccessful bribery can be much more dire than a mere loss of the money.

The Administration's Ceylon policies had the U.S. in hot water even before the ouster of Sir John's regime. Since 1952, Ceylon has been shipping rubber to Red China under a five-year rubber-for-rice agreement. This trade was not entirely satisfactory to Ceylon. For one thing, the Communists were hedging on their obligations; in December 1955, China's unfavorable trade balance was reportedly in the neighborhood of $10,500,000. But perhaps more important: the rubber traffic was depriving Ceylon of U.S. aid. Rubber is one of the strategic items on the CHINCOM international embargo list. Any nation that defies the embargo is, under the Battle Act of 1951, disqualified for U.S. aid—unless the President makes a special exception and reports it to Congress.

Since Ceylon was in an economic jam, the U.S. was anxious to help out. In the light of the tongue-lashing Kotelawala gave Chou En-lai at Bandung last summer, Sir John was considered by the U.S. to be a valuable ally; and Sir John's government was due for an electoral test. So the Administration began looking for ways to make Ceylon eligible for U.S. economic aid.

One possibility, that of Ceylon stopping its rubber trade with the Communists, was emphatically ruled out by the Ceylonese. Another, that of the U.S. offering to buy Ceylon's rubber at a price pegged at the higher-than-market price which the Communists had agreed to pay, was ruled out by the Administration on the grounds that the U.S. would have to give similar treatment to other rubber-producing countries and would thus end up subsidizing a world price-support program for rubber.

A third possibility was to delete rubber from the CHINCOM strategic embargo list. Accordingly—so this correspondent is informed—U.S. Assistant Secretary of State George Allen advised Ceylon's Ambassador to Washington, R. S. S. Gunewardene, late in January that Ceylon might expect U.S. economic aid following the forthcoming Eisenhower-Eden talks on relaxing the China trade embargo. However, the U.S.-British negotiations failed to produce the relaxation as soon as was expected—due, no doubt, to fear of heated congressional opposition to a general embargo relaxation.

"Presidential Exception"

Still determined to give Sir John a pre-election present, the Administration adopted the only remaining course open to it: in mid-February, Ceylon was put down for $5,000,000 a year in economic aid as a "special Presidential exception to the Battle Act." Thereupon, plans were laid for opening an ICA mission in Colombo. Assuming that Kotelawala would be re-elected, the Administration figured it could justify the exception to Congress by citing his Bandung performance.

But even had the election gone according to plan, the Administration was in for trouble from other quarters—concretely, from Thailand and Malaya which had been observing the rubber embargo against Red China as the price of receiving U.S. aid. Both countries had suffered serious losses by selling their rubber at low prices in the New York market, and thus were waiting anxiously to see what kind of deal Ceylon would get from the U.S.

An editorial in the February 21 issue of *Sathianraphap*, Bangkok's leading Thai-language daily, illustrates the kind of reaction to the Ceylon grant that the Administration had every reason to expect. After paying its respects to Ceylon's diplomacy (Ceylon "has gained a diplomatic victory over the biggest world power, thus enabling that small country to benefit from aid given to it by both the Communists and the free world in a most satisfying manner"), *Sathianraphap* called attention to Thailand's new opportunities: "If Thai merchants . . . sell rubber to Red China openly . . . the United States will not raise any obstacles, or conduct herself in any way different from the way in which she has acted toward Ceylon because it would only cause misunderstanding to the Thai people without justification."

Painful Alternatives

Such were the Administration's problems *before* the anti-Kotelawala landslide. Ceylon's switch to neutralism confronts the Administration with a new problem, and forces it to choose between two very painful alternatives.

The Administration can go ahead with its Ceylonese aid program as promised. In which case, a) President Eisenhower must try to sell Congress, already up in arms over nations on the U.S. payroll trading with the enemy, on the desirability of giving $5,000,000 a year to a country that ships large amounts of rubber to China —a country, moreover, that plans to establish diplomatic relations with Moscow and Peiping, to nationalize foreign-owned tea and rubber plantations and to take over British naval and air bases. And b) the Administration must accept the impossibility of preventing strategic trade between other Asiatic countries (*i.e.*, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya and Japan) and Red China.

Or the Administration can renege on its undertaking to send aid to Ceylon. In which case, the Administration will have done precisely what Mr. Dulles spent all his waking hours last month telling Asiatics the U.S. could never do (because it is "wicked")—namely, make adherence to U.S. policies a condition for receiving U.S. aid.

What's Wrong with Nixon?

The myths about the Vice President, says a friendly critic, obscure his integrity—even in his errors

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

I once heard an argument between two partially deaf people over a certain character on whose merits they could not agree. It turned out that one of the disputants was talking about Admiral Byrd while the other was dissecting Aaron Burr. The argument drifted off into slightly alcoholic inconclusiveness without either person realizing that no contact whatsoever had been made with reality.

I am reminded of their weird encounter every time I listen to the more intellectual Republican partisans quarrel over the character of Vice President Richard M. Nixon. They always seem to be talking about two different people. The real Nixon never comes clear. The partisans who have Admiral Byrd (so to speak) in mind are convinced that Richard Nixon is a dangerous "sleeper" who might veer sharply to the Right (way beyond Taft and oh-so-overwrought as an anti-Communist) if he were ever to become his own man as President. The believers in Nixon as a practitioner of Aaron Burr skulduggery are certain that he is a trimmer and a renegade from a position that might be described as a composite of Joe McCarthy on Communism and spying and Merwin K. Hart on basic economics.

These people are not inhabiting a rational world, for they are projecting their own fears on a character whose motives and philosophy (or lack of it) make no connection with their emotional assumptions. But before going into the subject of Nixon's character, it should be noted that the behavior which they pile on top of their assumptions is also irrational. In a rational world (given the Byrd-Burr theory of Nixon's personality) one would look to see the embattled partisans uniting to give the Vice President the bum's rush out of office. But instead of uniting to vote their mutual antipathies, the partisans of the two anti-Nixon schools of thought are agreed, at the moment at least, that Dick Nixon must have a second term! The first group is fearful of trifling with Nixon's political pulling power, which was clearly demonstrated by the New Hampshire write-in vote. (Whether the write-in was spontaneous or cleverly engineered by the lieutenants of Senator Bridges is immaterial.) The second group, while disliking Nixon's person, love him as a symbol for the enemies he has made.

Thus the queer ways of American politics, which invariably take one to Minsk by going to Pinsk. But the queerest thing, to me, is not the irrational working of our two-party system (which I am for, as the only practical alternative to periodic bloodbaths) but the fact that the anti-Nixon factions which are supporting Nixon are each believers in a Nixon that is as mythical as the gryphon or the unicorn. Nixon is no nefarious "sleeper," no devious trimmer, but simply a rather open young man with decent impulses. His commitment to anti-Communism is a matter of logic rather than deep emotional drive, which means that he will work on it only every third day, and his economics, while "free enterprise" in the main, are lightly dusted over with the pragmatism (meaning a willingness to compromise) that comes so easily to the American character.

For better or worse, Dick Nixon is typical of millions who are the despair of those who wish that struggles under the Capitol dome in Washington could make more significant contact with philosophical clarity. The fact that I am for him for Vice President (and for President in case of accident to Eisenhower) does not imply that I agree with all of his opinions; it merely implies that I would prefer to see a candidate who compromises in my direction to one whose compromises would pull the American system in the direction ADA desired.

The best way to arrive at a correct picture of Nixon is to explore his character in relation to the stereotypes which have gained currency about him ever since he stepped into the Hiss case as the one really pertinacious member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Fortunately, two recent books — ***Nixon***, by Ralph de Toledano (Holt, $3.00), and ***This is Nixon: The Man and His Work***, by James Keogh (Putnam, $2.75) — make this exploration rather easy. Both Mr. de Toledano and Mr. Keogh have done their work hurriedly, and the tone of each is that of a campaign-year partisanship that would never be mistaken for a *sub specie aeternitatis* view. But these are workaday books by workaday journalists, good enough for their immediate purpose, which is to dispel the myths about a man who is running for office right now.

Nixon's Anti-Communism

Taking the stereotypes up seriatim, there is, first, the notion that Dick Nixon is only a fair-weather anti-Communist. I would doubt the imputation of opportunism on the anti-Communist score for one very good reason: Whittaker Chambers swears by Nixon, and thinks he has acted correctly in not associating himself with anti-Communists who are indifferent to accuracy in presenting their testimony. In other words, if Nixon is currently anti-anti-Communist, then so is Chambers.

There is a deeper reason, however, for believing that Nixon can be counted on to be anti-Communist whenever the chips are really down, and that is his intellectual understanding of Marxism in both its theoretical and practical aspects. I recall a long conversation with him at the time of the Indo-Chinese crisis. Almost alone among government officials, Nixon had a clear perception of the nature of Communist dynamism in international affairs. He knew that Communism slips across borders by seepage and by waging "peace." He was for

taking a stand at the time of Dien Bien Phu as a practical matter of halting the seepage and cutting out the nonsense about the possibility of ever "negotiating" true peace with a Communist force.

In the minds of many, Nixon backed down on the proposal to stop the Communists in Indo-China. Senator Knowland, so Nixon's critics aver, has been far more steadfast in his opposition to truckling to the Communists whenever they wave a phony olive branch and let loose a hawk disguised as a dove. But Nixon, I am convinced, shut up on the Indo-Chinese issue merely because of his conception of the proper type of behavior required of a Vice President.

Under the American system, the Vice President cannot make policy. He is essentially a glorified errand boy, and he must behave as such. His role in policy making is limited to persuasion, and the possibilities of actively steering events inevitably cease once a decision has been accepted and acted on by the President in conjunction with the Cabinet. True, a Vice President could resign if he happened to be out of sympathy with his chief. But that would mean that he would not live to fight again. If Nixon had resigned at the time of the Indo-Chinese crisis he would merely have cleared the track for someone with a far less comprehensive view of the nature of Communism. And his successor, of course, would have been in line for the Presidency if Eisenhower's September coronary had proved lethal. Just how that would have served the anti-Communist cause is a little hard to fathom.

The Taftian Approach

The second big stereotype about Nixon is that he has been "Slippery Dick" in his relation to the Taft wing of the Republican Party. But, like Bob Taft himself, Nixon has never been philosophically clear on the need to limit the federal government's function in economic matters to that of umpire and policeman of contracts. It should not be forgotten that Bob Taft made his own compromises with philosophical purity on such things as public housing and federal aid to education. Nixon, as both de Toledano and Keogh show, is for a Taftian approach to a system of government

which will not compel some people to subsidize others. But it is just an approach, for Nixon has never been for a complete non-subsidy society.

If Nixon is not for complete voluntarism in social and economic affairs, it must still be said that he is a paragon of clarity about the workings of the American system when compared to Jerry Voorhis (whom he defeated for the House in 1946) or to Helen Gahagan Douglas (who lost to Nixon in the Senatorial election of 1950). In late 1945 Nixon made a significant statement about his fundamental social position. In reply to a committee which was interested in running him for Congress, he said: "One line of thought, advocated by the New Deal, is government control in regulating our lives. The other calls for individual freedoms and all that initiative can produce. I hold with the latter viewpoint. I believe the returning veterans, and I have talked to many of them in the foxholes, will not be satisfied with a dole or a government handout. They want a respectable job in private industry, where they will be recognized for what they produce, or they want an opportunity to start their own business." That is still Nixon's general orientation. If he backs down from it in detail, he is simply behaving like most other American politicians, Bob Taft included.

The important question to be settled at this particular point by those who are interested in a free and fluid society is, "If not Nixon, who else?" Taking their behavior and pronouncements at face value, I find very little to choose between Nixon and, say, Governor Christian Herter of Massachusetts on most important issues. They are both for some admixtures of socialization in economic matters. On foreign economic aid they both formed their ideas during the famous Herter Committee junket to Europe to study the need for Marshall Plan dispensations on the spot. But Nixon is more aggressive than Herter, and he would presumably be less vulnerable to the call of the "Geneva Spirit." As for Nixon versus Knowland, I find little to choose between them on the specific subject of Asia, or on much else, for that matter.

As a matter of curiosity, I have been collecting reasons for displacing Nixon as the Vice Presidential candidate by talking the subject over with commuters. Most of the reasons have to do with the intangibles of personality, but many of them hinge on canards floated by the fellow travelers. One woman, obviously a worker in the theater, said she was against him "because of the awful things he said about Helen Gahagan Douglas in 1950." But the "awful things" turned out to be the assertion that Mrs. Douglas frequently voted with Vito Marcantonio in the House, which happens to have been quite true.

Another objection to Nixon is that he has a "prosecutor's mentality," which would be tantamount to putting a District Attorney's point of view in the White House if he were ever to become President. Still another objection is that he is a brash and pushing young man, the implication being that people just don't like to be ruled by anyone who is over-ambitious.

The points of view that emphasize Nixon's prosecutor background and his undoubted ambition are certainly relevant, for the tone of a society is affected by the personal flavor of its leadership. But they are interesting to me at the moment for quite another reason. Taken altogether, they make mincemeat of the particular theory, pushed by the intellectuals, that Nixon is a cunningly devious man who a) hides his true opinions or b) changes them periodically to suit the prevailing winds. I find Nixon four-square even in his errors, which is one reason why I like him.

Foreign Trends . . . w.s.

"Constitutional Dictatorship" in France?

A desperate (and, for a change, patriotic) intrigue makes the backstage of French politics once more the area of actual decisions. Five former Premiers — Edgar Faure, René Pleven, Pierre Mendès-France, Paul Reynaud and Georges Bidault — have joined forces, though ever so cagily, to make the Chamber draft de Gaulle as the Prime Minister of a great national rally. The fact that Mendès-France is a leading member of the incumbent cabinet has, of course, not prevented his participation in a political conspiracy that aims at the overthrow of Guy Mollet. From the day of Mollet's inauguration, Mendès-France has never hidden his contempt for the inconclusive M. Mollet — and has never fought his desire to get even for the humiliation of playing a subdued second fiddle in Mollet's subdued ensemble.

Mendès-France's personal paper, *L'Express* (which has returned from daily to weekly publication), has already openly demanded Mollet's resignation. Now it is always considered proper, timely and popular in France to ask for the Prime Minister's head; but the Mendès-France clique this time is more than usually in tune with the prevailing mood: the Mollet government has reached a state of paralysis which begins to scare even French parliamentarians into distressed patriotic action.

The latest and apparently hopeless impasse occurred in Algeria. The *colons*, the ruling French minority in Algeria, reject any governmental compromise with the native rebels, threaten to respond to any such compromise with a rebellion of their own, and seem to be in utter earnest. Thus the Mollet government is doomed if it does and doomed if it doesn't. If it suppresses the native upsurge with adequate military force, it will be embroiled in a colonial war at least as nasty, and certainly just as despised in France, as was the deadly bloodletting in Indo-China. If it negotiates acceptable reforms with the Arabs, the French Government will have to shoot at Frenchmen in Algeria. Both courses are clearly against the grain of a government that cannot claim a popular majority to begin with.

Besides, M. Lacoste, Mollet's resident deputy in Algeria, has estimated (and rather conservatively) that not fewer than 400,000 soldiers are needed to secure French control of Algeria. And this time they would have to be really *French* contingents; for, obviously, no colonial troops could be used against this articulate and persuasive colonial revolution. The present military force in Algeria is considerably below 200,000 men. In other words, M. Lacoste asks for more than 200,000 young draftees from metropolitan France. What's worse (as far as the economical Frenchmen are concerned), he asks for a 1956 emergency budget of more than a billion dollars. In short, M. Lacoste asks for the impossible.

Consequently, the Mollet Cabinet has assumed the weird posture of motionless hysteria. Nobody any longer pays much attention to Mollet (except, perhaps, the U.S. State Department — and, of course, the French Communists who hope to lure the unhappy Socialists into a Popular Front). And no matter how much they hate one another, Messrs. Faure, Pleven, Mendès, Reynaud and Bidault know a chance when they see one. The only chance left is de Gaulle.

De Gaulle, to be sure, has receded into an almost mystical isolation and isn't even willing to play political parlor games with the party that once rallied around him. But now that he is alone, his price has paradoxically gone up: no longer is he willing to accept an ordinary parliamentary mandate; now he would serve only if called as a "constitutional dictator" — like one of the Consuls-Dictators of ancient Rome.

The five former Premiers who are eagerly selling the idea to an increasingly interested Chamber emphasize its very sensationalism. Nothing, they argue, but the shock of the Chamber's abdication could possibly electrify the nation into disciplined endeavor. Whatever course France may finally choose in Algeria, only a person of de Gaulle's timber will command the respect among the French *colons* there which, so unabashedly and so dangerously, they deny any parliamentary government.

From de Gaulle there has come nothing so far but lofty silence. And it is unlikely that he will break this silence before the Chamber has irrevocably committed itself. At this writing, the plan of the five former Premiers calls for an unprecedented initiative of the parliamentary factions that form the Mollet coalition — an appeal to the government to resign in favor of a man who isn't even a member of this parliament. The plan is indeed bold and indubitably undemocratic. But its very boldness may make it irresistibly attractive to an ambushed army of French politicians: Poujade and the Communists at their flanks, the rebellious Arabs in front of them, and nothing in the rear but defeat in any forthcoming election, they may decide to sign up with de Gaulle's somewhat foreign legion of "constitutional dictatorship."

Whose Dictatorship?

Their 20th Congress has, perhaps by an oversight, laid bare the social structure of the Soviet Union's Communist Party.

The Soviet Union, the Communists claim (and any number of college teachers repeat uncritically), is "a government of workers and peasants" or, in more orthodox Leninist language, a "dictatorship of the proletariat." And these workers and peasants, or so the Party insists, exercise their power through "their" Communist Party.

According to statistics released to the 20th Congress, this is the nature of the Party's membership: 1,901,000 "working in industry, transportation and construction"; 1,331,000 "working in Sovkhoses and Kolkhoses"; and 3,983,000 "working otherwise."

In short, of a total Party membership of 7,215,000, almost four million members (more than 55 per cent) are engaged in "non-productive" activities — meaning, of course, Party and Government and MVD work. Far from being a party of "workers and peasants," the Communist Party of the Soviet Union executes the parasitic bureaucracy's dictatorship *over* the proletariat.

Letter from London

F. A. VOIGT

The New Leader: Stalin

The British public, or that small part of it which gives more than a passing thought to such matters, is quite willing to accept the new officially soiled portrait of Stalin. But the new portrait is, of course, untrue. He was certainly a liar and a murderer. But he was not a bungler. No doubt he made mistakes, but history will paint him as the principal architect of Russia's present power. Of the world's three leading statesmen during the critical years—Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill—Stalin immeasurably surpassed the other two in statecraft, cunning, realism and determination.

Autocracy can only be vested in one man. It must also be permanent and, therefore, persist beyond the life of that one man. It cannot be shared by another, save in the period of transition between the death of one autocrat and the full establishment of his successor. The autocrat is absolute and infallible, and his office is eternal. He decides what is orthodox (what is Communism) and how the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin are to be interpreted.

For Lenin, the dictatorship, the terror and the purges were still a means to an end—namely, Communism. He was an autocrat, but (it seems) reluctantly so. Autocracy as a permanent institution was the conscious conception of Stalin. The purge as a means, not to Communism, but to the consolidation, perpetuation and extension of the autocracy, became an organic part of that institution. It remains so to the present day. In fact, the recent defamation of Stalin is another example of the purge—of applied Stalinism.

The purge does not only exterminate — or "liquidate" — its victims physically. Its essential purpose is moral extermination through defamation. It is more convenient to kill the victims than to keep them alive; but it matters little whether the victim be physically alive or dead, as long as he is morally dead or, rather, damned. Stalin dead is but the last victim of the purge.

Does his extermination through defamation mean a change in policy? There has been a change in Russia; but it has not been a change from Stalinism to something else. It is a change *within* the context of Stalinism—a change of the kind which Stalin himself brought about in the late twenties and in the thirties.

The present oligarchy is officially termed "collective government." Stalin established "collective government" after the death of Lenin. "Collective government," as conceived by himself in those days, and today by his oligarchy which exists to establish the successors, is nothing other than an autocratic succession. The traditional form of oligarchy in revolutionary Russia is the triumvirate or "troika." But the present oligarchy is a duumvirate which combines the power of the state and of the Party in the persons of Khrushchev and Bulganin. Whether either of these men or some third will be *the* autocrat may not be apparent for a long time. (Stalin was autocrat long before he was known to be such.)

Terms like "collective leadership" and "peaceful coexistence" served to conceal the reality of the autocracy and the preparations for foreign conquest even in the late twenties. Then, as now, the emphasis was placed on "peace" and on intensified industrialization and the recruitment of technicians—for the purpose of increasing not the prosperity but the military power of the Soviet State. Industrialization as a means to power rather than to welfare is an explicit doctrine of Lenin's. Peaceful coexistence, then, as now, meant agreements or even alliances with countries that might be radically anti-democratic. Such agreements are now adumbrated in the collective term "neutralism."

Addressing the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party on June 26, 1934, Stalin declared—as Khrushchev and Bulganin have declared since his death—that Russia was "fighting to preserve peace." She would, he said, "meet half way" the countries which "are not interested in disturbing the peace" (today called the "peace-loving countries") and she would conclude "pacts of non-aggression." He gave as examples of his policy the "improved relations" with Turkey, Italy, France, Poland, the Baltic States, China, and the U.S. The existence of "Facism is not the issue," he said; and in saying this he pointed particularly to Germany where Hitler had been in power for nearly a year. "Our foreign policy," he declared (as do his successors today), "is a policy of preserving peace and strengthening commercial relations with all countries. . . . We stand for peace and champion the cause of peace."

The words "pragmatism" and "flexibility" have been used, correctly, to describe Russian policy as it is today. The same two words could have been used to describe Stalin's policy in the twenties and throughout the thirties. His pact with Hitler, ostensibly concluded to preserve the peace, ensured the advent of World War Two. This pact, the invasion of Finland, the annexation of the Baltic States and the partition of Poland (countries Stalin had specially mentioned as exemplifying "improved relations" with the Soviet Union) were striking examples of his own "pragmatism" and "flexibility."

But in one respect there is a difference, and a big one: the means at the disposal of the autocracy are far greater in 1956 than they were in 1934. By the prodigious increase in her own industrial production; by the success with which she has recruited and trained her "cadres" and "technicians"; by the annexation of Central and Eastern European countries which, together, yield an industrial production comparable with that of Great Britain or of Germany before the war; by the elimination of Germany, Japan and (in effect) France as great military powers; and by her alliance with China, today in process of becoming a great military power, Soviet Russia is incomparably stronger than she ever was before.

THE IVORY TOWER

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

A Look Around at the College Dailies

Princeton

Last week, the *Daily Princetonian* announced the decision of the Whig-Cliosophic Society to bring to Princeton, to speak on the spirit of Geneva, Alger Hiss. Hiss, said the *Princetonian,* is an "alleged Communist." An editorial in the same issue praised Princeton's most celebrated apologist for pro-Communists, H. H. Wilson of the Department of Political Science, for his introduction to "liberal Corliss Lamont's" new book, *Freedom is as Freedom Does.*

Mr. Lamont's thesis, which is endorsed by Mr. Wilson, is, roughly, that the Communist menace is a figment of McCarthy's imagination, and that the security program ought to be, again speaking roughly, scrapped. It is comforting to the editors of the *Princetonian* to share a campus with Mr. Wilson — for he "seems to be one of a minority which, in security matters, can still see the forest in spite of the trees."

Yale

It is so obvious to the editors of the *Yale Daily News* that what has issued over the years from congressional investigating committees with respect to Communism is sheer nonsense, that they were caught by surprise when the Eastland Committee came out with its Handbook on Communism — of which, it turns out, they approve. "It may seem somewhat paradoxical that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee should profess to know the methods of weeding out Communist conspiratorial factions within this country"—rather like the Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals pretending to expertness in gynecology—"And yet, after years of tearing the heart out of cherished American civil liberties, this Senate Subcommittee has issued a report which constitutes valuable reading. . . ."

Minneapolis

In Minneapolis, a minor fuss was kicked up after the announcement was made that Communist Herbert Aptheker had been invited to the University of Minnesota to lecture on "The Negro's Future."

The College *Daily,* however, found it "gratifying that a speaker of this nature is allowed to come here." The *Daily* reported, the day after the lecture, that "the dominant note" of the overflow crowd of students at the large auditorium had been one of "curiosity and skepticism." "One student," the paper reported, "asked him to what degree the party line had affected his opinions on these matters. Aptheker said he had arrived at the science of Marxism in his 'search for truth,' and that he used the Marxist system of logic in his analysis and conclusions."

Brandeis

Terrible is the wrath of student editors, throughout the length and breadth of the land, at NATIONAL REVIEW and its inquiry into indoctrination in American colleges and universities. Last December, the magazine announced a research project aimed at determining whether, notwithstanding its stated dedication to the principles of academic freedom, the university world is engaged in indoctrinating its students in the Liberal position. Says *Justice,* of Brandeis University: ". . . the attempt . . . to convince readers of the parallelism between the simple spying advocated by Buckley and a research project is downright infuriating. Moreover, the attempt at covering the whole affair with the haze of the words 'academic freedom' and at whitewashing it with references to the ACLU would be much more effective if they weren't so absurdly out of place and so obviously contrived."

Virginia

The University of Virginia's *Cavalier* concludes that NATIONAL REVIEW's project "defied classification." But in the interests of making a stab at it, the editor says the project is in one sense the work of someone "having Fascist leanings," and most generally, that of a "crackpot."

Columbia

The editors of the Columbia *Spectator,* after trying out several reactions to the project, give up, saying "Actually we don't know whether to laugh at, or be just plain revolted by" us. "It is the most outrageous attempt to instigate snooping and sneaking, and arouse suspicion in the classroom, that we have heard of" — the editors here comply in classic fashion with the doctrine of Understatement — "in quite a while."

New York

Our very favorite appeared in the *Arrow,* of Hunter College, whose president, Mr. George Shuster, is a member of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, and has quite clearly saved Hunter for Democracy. "One hundred dollars for the most revealing information [is being offered by NATONAL REVIEW]. And Judas only received thirty pieces of silver . . . We can all work our way through college turning in teachers with whom we disagree. More fun than a Ku Klux Klan meeting . . . What sort of proponent of academic freedom can Mr. Buckley be, when he advocates a system that by its very nature breeds suspicion, conformity, fear, animosity, distrust, and thoughtfulness?" Yes, "thoughtfulness."

"Mr. Buckley reports that 'it is the contention of many informed conservatives that a very large number of teachers in this country are in fact actively engaged in indoctrinating their students in an identifiable position, loosely described as *liberal.*' In other words [*i.e.,* summing up the statement just quoted], even on the college level, Mr. Buckley suggests that one must conform or die."

See what we mean? Does anyone any longer doubt the advisability of our research project?

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Virtuosi di Roma: Adventure in Perfection

There finally came an evening, and in New York to boot, when this critic met with perfection. The emotional impact of such a meeting is probably beyond description; but I shall try to convey its intellectual meaning.

The event, needless to say, occurred off Broadway and, in fact, it was no stage event. It was a concert. The fourteen men who form the *Virtuosi di Roma* played seven concerti by Vivaldi and restored, for an evening of unforgettable beauty, one's confidence in the genius of the Italian race.

The *Virtuosi di Roma* are, to me, the most miraculous ensemble of the musical world — an orchestral group that is blessed with the "unearned grace" of leaving an audience limp with unmitigated delight. This quality of lifting an audience above and beyond the experience of unexceptionable acoustics is a charisma. The concert halls are overcrowded with artists who are earnest students and polished masters of their chosen instruments, and yet will never make other souls sing. They lack the charisma. The *Virtuosi di Roma* have it.

I cannot possibly resist the temptation to list, first of all, the names of the fourteen men. To Italian ears they may be common, but to the rest of us they are an enchantment in themselves and a promise of exactly the kind of music their bearers can indeed produce: Renato Fasano (conductor), Luigi Ferro (violin), Franco Gulli (violin), Edmondo Malanotte (violin), Benedetto Mazzacurati ('cello), Guido Mozzato (violin), Salvatore Pitzianti (contrabass), Alberto Poltronieri (violin), Renato Ruotolo (violin), Alfredo Sabbadini (viola and viola d' amore), Aleardo Savelli (viola), Antonio Valisi ('cello), Carlo Vidusso (cembalo) and Renato Zanfini (oboe). What these six violins, two 'celli, two violas, one contrabass, one cembalo and one oboe produce, flattered by an indescribably forceful conductor, is more than magic. It is the way music must have sounded on the first day — and the way I hope to hear it in the beyond.

Each of the *Virtuosi di Roma* is a virtuoso who is quite likely without a peer (at least in the interpretation of the music in which the group specializes — the precise Italian music of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries). They all double, not in brass, but in noble humility: most of the time, these virtuosi blend inconspicuously into group anonymity, just like any old third or sixth violinist in any old orchestra. But then a man who, during the preceding concerto, took fifth place among the violins, steps forward and plays the solo violin in, say, Vivaldi's Concerto in D-major — and plays it so that your heart goes out in jubilation and thankfulness. And then the man returns into group anonymity and continues to serve in abandoned dedication to Vivaldi.

It is this aura of dedication that gives the *Virtuosi di Roma* their unique distinction. They make music the way their forefathers built cathedrals — almost unaware of artistic egos, no one excelling, yet each one driven to perfection by the immense majesty of the enterprise. The churches of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries remain the wonders of architecture precisely because architecture, in building them, was a secondary concern; a group of craftsmen had worked together primarily to serve a God in Whom they very much believed. And this, it seems to me, is how the *Virtuosi di Roma* make music today: they believe, at the very least, in Vivaldi; and they are resolved to serve him. Everything else is secondary, including their own status as musicians. Which is precisely why, as musicians, they are incomparable.

Antonio Vivaldi (1678 - 1741), whom Johann Sebastian Bach revered as a master, wrote music in the same sense of dedication — with a sense, that is, of celebrating not himself but a super-personal objective creation. There is, in his music, no self-important brooding. Untouched by the *Sturm und Drang*, the studiously cultivated soul-tortures of modernity, Vivaldi wrote music the way he breathed and loved — freely and without self-conscious affectation.

Like all true masters—like Bach and Mozart and even Schubert — he piled up an opus that, in sheer volume, is inconceivable in a modern world that has come to mistake an artist's constipation for a corollary of some "titanic" struggle inside him. An average year's output of these true masters matches the life production of a modern composer. Vivaldi, you see, never thought of his personal "signature." He wrote music the way other craftsmen of his time carved stones—under the discipline of their craft, with loyalty to the transcendent meaning of the civilization in which they produced, proud of their objective vocation rather than their personal talent.

And so, Vivaldi's music is eternally new, and unbelievably joyful. The *Virtuosi di Roma* play it with this perfection because, manifestly, it is their idea of a feast. And, in all frankness, there creeps a note of envy into our thankful response to their playing: what dignified and altogether fulfilled lives they live, these fourteen men! In a world so clearly without inner direction, their existence is securely grounded in beauty. They have chosen to serve. In the demanding discipline of this service they are enviably free men.

There is a rumor that the *Virtuosi di Roma* will not return for another American tour before 1958. I refuse to believe it. And I particularly refuse to believe the explanation: that the group, on their country-wide travels through America, barely earned enough money to pay their expenses. Any person willing to spend $9.60 on two tickets to a Rodgers & Hammerstein musical, but not willing to spend half of that on the *Virtuosi di Roma*, is a pathetic victim of high-pressure barking. The heavenly music they make is not too sophisticated for the untrained ear (precisely because of its faithful perfection). And as long as you must wait for a festive evening with the *Virtuosi di Roma*, buy their RCA Victor record LHMV-26, Vivaldi's "The Seasons." That you can hear this miracle unfold on your record-player almost justifies the industrial revolution.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Too Much and Too Soon

REVILO OLIVER

In most editorial offices and on most college campuses, as everyone knows, the Liberals keep squadrons of jet-propelled intellectuals in constant readiness for screaming take-off at a moment's notice. What, they must now decide, are they to do about Lee Mortimer's book (*Around the World Confidential*, Putnam, $3.50)? Shall they pretend not to notice it, in the hope that it will pass for a mere international inventory of ordinary sin? Or should the squadrons be sent howling through the skies, to produce once more the uproar that has so often drowned out criticism of the One World gang?

If I were a Liberal, I should recommend the strategy of silence as the more promising in the present circumstances.[1]

Mr. Mortimer's book will indeed attract a great many readers who, with the single-minded and unshakeable optimism of armchair voluptaries, will eagerly press on to the last page in the hope that they may learn of some novelty in the practice of the world's oldest profession. It is also true that many of the people who most need the information on important matters which Mr. Mortimer also supplies, will be repelled by the diluted pornography of a book in which, by a strange parody of Gibbon's precaution, all licentious passages are left in the obscurity of a vulgar dialect — the Pidgin English spoken by the semi-civilized natives of Broadway. And many casual readers, I am afraid, will be so confused by the frequent juxtaposition of apparently unrelated topics that they may be left with the impression that our present foreign policy is as inevitable as prostitution and no more reprehensible.

Few readers will be in a position to pronounce with assurance concerning more than a few of the details that Mr. Mortimer claims to have observed in the course of his circumvolation of the world. The reliability of his reports must, therefore, be estimated in terms of the inherent plausibility of those to which we can apply the tests of common human experience. It is reassuring to find that these say precisely what we should on logical grounds expect a truthful observer to report.

If during the summer drought you go to the heart of a forest, place a barrel of jellied petroleum in a thicket, carefully cover the petroleum with an inch or two of water, place a few sticks of phosphorous in the water, and then walk away, the consequences may be predicted with almost mathematical certainty. If you use the taxing power of the American government to send a horde of agents into an Asiatic country to subvert its indigenous culture, exhort the natives to throw off the shackles of colonialism and Occidental civilization, excite the greed of the impoverished masses, and force on them the industrialism that has produced such acute social stresses in nations peopled by the race that invented it, the consequences may be predicted with almost mathematical certainty. Mr. Mortimer tells us that he sees smoke rising from the forest. Mr. Mortimer tells us that we are financing Communism in Asia. Should we believe him, or should we join the Liberals in their confidence that the laws of nature can be repealed by Rousseauistic jargon?

Mr. Mortimer points out that our State Department in its frantic attempt to gild the world with our gold begrudges scant contributions to the few remaining nations, such as Spain and Pakistan, which regard us as allies. He says that, meanwhile, it lavishly subsidizes our unmistakable enemies, such as Nehru, and uses its influence to discourage the healthy and conservative elements that still survive in such countries as France and Italy. These statements may be verified from public records. Our vast expenditure is buying us only the certainty of defeat and disaster.

The chief objection to this book, from a Liberal point of view, is that it does now what the Liberals will be doing later. Their strategy, you see, is basically simple and repetitive. They assured everyone on their word of honor that Russia was the citadel of true democracy and the bulwark of the Free World—until they were sure that the Russians had organized a strong military machine. Then in sudden horror and terror they announced that the Russians were so strong that it would be suicidal to attack them, and that the only feasible way of checking them was by building up the true democracy of the simple agrarians in China. Then, as soon as the gang was well established in China, it was the proper time to proclaim the awful fact that the Chinese had become so strong that it would be suicidal to permit MacArthur to hurt their feelings. Now, of course, the strategic point in Asia is India, and we are assured that Mr. Nehru is building up true democracy. He has not yet been equipped with the atomic bomb, since at present his greatest usefulness lies in his role of Pied Piper of "moderation" and "coexistence." When the proper time comes, however, the Liberals—if they can keep Mr. Mortimer from jumping the gun—will have to recognize, with their usual wails of surprise and hor-

[1] (This book has been virtually ignored by the strategic book-sections of the Liberal press. The latter has also been declining paid advertisements in its behalf.—THE EDITORS)

ror, the existence of another enemy who has somehow become too strong to be challenged by our puny nation. And you may be very sure that at that time our placid beast of burden, the American taxpayer, will be exhorted to make even greater sacrifices, so that our strategists can check the growing conflagration by spraying the gasoline of "economic aid" on the next country on their schedule.

Moral for Our Times

Student Life in Ave Maria College, Mediaeval Paris, by Astrik L. Gabriel. 460 pp. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press. $6.75

John of Hubant, a cleric and royal counselor, founded little Ave Maria College in 1336, hard by the great abbey of Sainte-Geneviève, in Paris. With a master, chaplain and six students (eventually they increased to eight), the college endured until 1769. Until the publication of Professor Gabriel's thorough history, this college has had scarcely more than bare mention in the books on medieval learning. The present volume includes the College's Chartulary, in Latin, and is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the ends and methods of Christian education in the late Middle Ages.

One very interesting feature of Ave Maria was that the students (who were only eight to sixteen years old) had in their charge the maintenance of attached almshouses for old men and women, and also the support of six poor students somewhat older, candidates for the licentiate in arts. Thus charity was taught to the boys of Ave Maria through practical administration. This College, though associated with the University of Paris, more nearly resembled one of the old English charity schools for boys than it did the university-colleges for more mature students.

Only one offense was punishable by whipping: mutilation of the College's few books. Out of such scraps and tags of ancient learning as it possessed, Ave Maria gave its students a knowledge of grammar and logic which all our modern expensive educational "plant" rarely succeeds in equalling. And Ave Maria inculcated in its handful of students a reverence for learning, a true sense of charity, and an understanding of spiritual obligation, which many of our modern universities think altogether beyond their cognizance. This college at last gave up the ghost when its master squandered its endowment upon an extravagant rebuilding program. Learning, I am inclined to think, flourishes upon voluntary poverty, but stifles under the weight of grandiose expenditure; a moral for our times.

RUSSELL KIRK

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.
Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: .....
(name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

Big Brotherly Reference Book

Twentieth Century Authors: First Supplement, edited by Stanley J. Kunitz. 1,123 pp. New York: H. W. Wilson Co. $8.00

This book purports to offer biographies or autobiographies of all authors still kicking or not yet cold whose works are reasonably familiar to readers of English. It is, moreover, the only book to which one can conveniently turn for such information. Book reviewers depend upon it, and it is a tool that no reference library can do without. But it is a tool with a subtly devised slant to its cutting edge.

And the slant is clearly to the left.

The previous edition, published in 1942, naturally reflected the "popular front" feeling of the majority of American intellectuals. Given the climate of the late thirties and early forties, that fact we may generously overlook. But the new edition continues the trend and, by masking it with an ersatz patina of nonpartisanship, makes it even more insidious and calculated.

The declared aim of the book is not to appraise the writers treated, or judge them. A writer gets in, that is to say, not through merit but through the influence he exerts. But the balance-sheet of inclusions and exclusions is a very curious one.

Granville Hicks and Owen Lattimore are included, but not Whittaker Chambers or Louis Budenz. There is room for John Howard Lawson, Howard Fast, Albert Maltz, Edgar Snow and Vera Micheles Dean, but not for Russell Kirk, Frank Chodorov, Henry Hazlitt, Raymond Moley or Ralph de Toledano.

Included among journalists are Drew Pearson, Walter Lippmann, Max Lerner, Jay Franklin, Marquis Childs, Heywood Broun, Elmer Davis, Raymond Swing, Alistair Cooke, Ralph Ingersoll and Anna Louise Strong. No doubt they all deserved to be included, but by what process of definition could the editor have left out, as leave out he did, such influential figures as David Lawrence, George Sokolsky, Westbrook Pegler and even honest old H. V. Kaltenborn?

Ludwig von Mises, one of the great economists of the century, is passed up in favor of G. D. H. Cole, Seymour E. Harris, Frederick Schuman, Henry Steele Commager, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Corliss Lamont, Robert Morrison MacIver, and many another friend of man.

No mention is made of Roscoe Pound, or of George Catlin, Werner Jaeger, E. A. Burtt, Halford J. Mackinder, Salo Wittmayer Baron, M. Rostovtzev, Russell Davenport, Frederick Woodbridge, William Pepperell Montague, T. V. Smith, Samuel Lubell, Hugh Seton-Watson or Joseph Schumpeter. And on the literary side, such excellent writers as R. V. C. Bodley, Zoe Oldenbourg, Terence Rattigan, Laurens van der Post, Henri Peyre, Horton Foote, John Moore and Byron Herbert Reece have all failed to attract the editor's attention. And here, too, one could go on.

Of course, any conservative who laments all this will be called a "witch hunter," or "book-burner,"

or an enemy of the five-cent cigar. This review, for instance, will probably induce a "climate of fear" in every library and eighth grade study hall in the Republic. *Tant mieux*! Let's call a spade a spade and ignore those librarians. EDWARD CASE

No Smug Editorials

Work of Darkness, by Jack Karney. 279 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $3.50

"Juvenile delinquency" is rapidly becoming another of those catch-all, amulet phrases—"virus" is another—with which we comfortably muddle our understanding of afflictions which may originate in our own flaccid willpower as much as the "age," or "society," or the "weather."

We keep hearing, for instance, that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. But if we look closely, we see that what is really on the increase is parental laxity. As long as there are fathers who spare the rod—not to spoil the child, but to save themselves the trouble of being adults—there will be teen-agers doing anything for a thrill. As long as there are parents who look to the government, to society, to their minister, to advertising claims, to anything, anyone, to set their private houses in order, there will be children whom these same parents and their toadying PTA lecturers can self-deludingly call "juvenile delinquents."

My point is, we have no right to confuse this unnecessary mutation with the real thing, which has always bred in the lowest economic strata of large cities, and whose number is probably no greater today than it ever was, proportionately. This sort of juvenile delinquent—Oliver Twist was one—is not someone we need to write exasperated editorials about. His home, standard of living, and immediate prospects are about as bleakly unenviable as any free man's can be. If he is exceptional, or lucky, he gets out. If he is average, or below, he is trapped.

Jack Karney has written a brisk, undidactic novel about three such boys. They belong to a gang called the Panthers. They do miscellaneous dirty work for organized adult criminals, and end up in a tenement room waiting for professional gunmen to track them down and murder them. As a member of New York City's DA office, Mr. Karney has seen what he is writing about. He draws a keenly graphic picture, and offers no smug editorials.

This sort of juvenile delinquency is real, and sad, and has always been with us. Only willing human love can do much to relieve it. Whether we have any or not to give, we should at least remember that it is profoundly different in kind from the frivolous pranking around in middle-class suburbs, where bored adolescents get into trouble because their progressive parents are too morally neuter and gutless to cut birch sticks and apply them as often as necessary.

ROGER BECKET

Tauromachy

Bull Fever, by Kenneth Tynan. 221 pp. New York: Harper & Bros. $5.00

The art of bullfighting is in a continuous state of evolution and revolution. The matador who would have been most admired for correct killing fifty years ago (during the reign of Bombita, Machaquito and Vicente Pastor) would be put far down on the list today—unless he could offer some at least of Litri's feverish dramatic emotion, or of the aesthetic mastery that emanates, like music, from Ordoñez. More and more comparative credit is being given for work done with the cape and the *muleta*, and the importance of the sword diminishes in consequence. In other words, the "moment of truth," when the sword is used to kill, must always be the climax of the fight, but the gradient to the climax has become less abrupt, more gradual.

Hemingway's *Death in the Afternoon* (wrong as he is about Spanish psychology, what with *toreros* and gypsies *voluntarily* joining the Reds in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*), is still the most reliable handbook there is for the *suertes* (passes of the cape and the *muleta* and *estocadas*), however misleading it may be when it tries to explain the mental reactions of the crowd. John Marks' *To the Bullfight*, as far as it goes, is the best all-round handbook, both scientifically and psychologically; and his big volume, when it appears, should be the alpha and omega of tauromachy, ranking with Cassio's monumental three volumes, *Los Toros. Bull Fever* brings all the previous works up to date, and is thus welcome, since new stars appear, and new passes are invented yearly. For one who has been interested for so short a time in tauromachy, Mr. Tynan has learned a great deal. Moreover, he writes very well, though somewhat effeminately at times, and describes vividly, with an amiable tendency to exaggeration (the more refreshing because he is an Englishman) — as when he referred to Litri's alleged morbidity, which is nearer mysticism or sanctity, as "superstition." Religiousness, I take it, is not *necessarily* superstition.

I call Mr. Tynan British, in spite of his name, since he has been thoroughly anglicized — that is, taken over by the most superstitious people alive. Spelling GOD backwards, the British worship DOG, so that their Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is nearly a hundred times better endowed and more vigilant than their Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. They worship Amubis and other beasts, and indulge in cruelty to and neglect of children on a scale unparallelled anywhere else — there have been 12,000 court cases, I am told, in two years! (The heathen Egyptians of 1,000 B.C. also had their "Animal Week," and raised money in the streets to found homes for distressed scorpions, centipedes, cockroaches and colorado beetles, which they subsequently mummified.) It is quite a feather in Mr. Tynan's cap to have written a book that has infuriated the animalites of his country into trying to stop passports being issued for Spain.

Tynan's photos are superb, but he disfigures his book on the title page with an execrable drawing, apparently intended to be a fighting bull, which he furnishes with half an udder and deprives of half its neck muscle — to rectify which faults he should study photos Numbers 2 and 32 in his own book. His drawing is more like a depilated female Yak than a male *Bos Hispanicus*. ROY CAMPBELL

To the Editor

Trojan Horsemen

I agree with William Henry Chamberlin [April 11] that "anti-anti-Communist" is an awkward term. I suggest an alternate description for these people. Wittingly or not, they are weakening our internal defenses—softening us for enemy infiltration. Why not then call them "the Trojan Horsemen"?

Brooklyn, N.Y. IRWIN LOKOS

Mr. Fischer's Logic

John Fischer's article on NATIONAL REVIEW [*Harper's*, March 1956] is a curious mixture of twisted logic and false reasoning, including a little *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*, in the best Liberal style.

It's possible, of course, that he does not understand all the nuances of the English language, since he says your editorials are merely "earnest" and "humorless." Or perhaps he does not know that humor can be in deadly earnest. . . .

New York City MARY REISNER

I know that you're supposed to take a lot for the cause. But too much is too much. In *Harper's* you are called "humorless" by John Fischer. That's what I mean by too much. I know—I've read his books. . . .

Chicago, Ill. JACOB BROTSKY

Supreme Court Decision

. . . In the April 11 issue you carry a letter from a Mr. Edward T. Welch . . . concerning the school "decision" of the Nine Old Sociologists. Mr. Welch . . . opines that the issue . . . "is whether or not the law of the land, the Constitution, will be accepted and applied in the South. . . ."

Article 6 of the Constitution identifies "the supreme law of the land" as "This Constitution and the *laws* of the United States which shall be *made in pursuance thereof.*" I have supplied the emphasis, because, as all must know . . . it is the Congress and the Legislatures of the several states, and *not* the Supreme Court, who "make laws." But that is what the Court arrogated to itself in the school case, *i.e.*, the power to "make laws."

Indeed, even the Nine Old Sociologists themselves do not agree with your Mr. Welch for they did not cite law or constitutional authority on which to ground their "decision"; they relied on . . . "economists" and "sociologists."

Washington, D.C. HALSEY MCGOVERN

The Controversial Mr. Schlamm

I am so pleased with the magazine that I was shocked to read the flagrant insult to Catholic priests ["Arts and Manners," March 21] . . . . I think you had better change the mind of Mr. Schlamm, or change the person for a more civilized contributor.

MRS. LEO B. JENKINS
Weaverville, Cal.

. . . Editor Schlamm should, in fact, be canonized for his keenly perceptive analyses and adroit pillorying of the fraudulent "culture" being disseminated to the unsuspecting, half Bolshevized millions. . . .

Weste Berne, N.Y. E. R. HUNSICKER

Republican Party

. . . As Lincoln knew, a republic must know what it is fighting for. Its might is in the right. Often it is hard to know what is right even when it is the common concern for all men and today that is far from being the case. I think the Republican Party deserves to be enlightened in a generous spirit about the cause for which its Administration could bring forth the fruits of its labors. In this job you are already doing perfectly.

Pelham, N.Y. ARTHUR EGAN

Benefits of Liberalism

Stop, you nasty old conservatives! What are you trying to do? Stop progress? Our Liberal saviours have forsaken their former scholarly raiment and come to our rescue.

We had no income tax. But now we do. We had no huge national debt. But now we do . . . We didn't have labor organizations nominating Presidential candidates before. . . .We never used to . . . leave a war without honor. But now we do.

Don't you see the merits of these changes? Why not repent, give up your sinful ways and join the *New Republic* staff? Come in, the lucre's fine.

New York City B. L. MENCKEN

Enjoys Wit

. . . I enjoy the original, candid and witty style of the writer of your "The Week" and I nearly died laughing at Peter Crumpet's piece on Kefauver, and the cartoon!! then the *Punch* cartoon!!!

Los Angeles, Cal. ELIZABETH HAMM

Definitions

A fine magazine, your NATIONAL REVIEW. It's a pleasure to read, but may not appeal to the general run of magazine readers for just that reason.

Your choice of coverage is as nearly all-encompassing as possible in that format. To add to it, could there be a section on definitions? After all, just what constitutes an "intellectual," a "reactionary," etc? What is a "moderate progressive"? What do *you* mean by "pragmatic" or "esoteric"?

I feel that we each could take a different meaning in the words we use. Not Webster's meaning, but the aura that grows with usage. Perhaps you could have Definitions for Libertarians.

Syracuse, N.Y. ANN C. FLOOD

Public Colleges

. . . NATIONAL REVIEW has become an integral part of my existence. Each issue provides "ammunition" for our running battle with the campus "liberals."

. . . the taxpaying public might be interested in how their money is spent at rapidly growing institutions such as Queens College, for, in the last analysis, it is Joe Doakes, strap-hanging reader of the *Daily News*, who is the alumnus and benefactor of our public colleges.

New York City RICHARD WHALEN

Laurels to Mr. Kendall

A laurel wreath to Willmoore Kendall for laying low the Liberal louts! His "Liberal Line" of March 14 is worth treble the cost of one year's subscription.

Chicago, Ill. CHARLES M. HANNA

You'll always look your well-groomed best

in suits and slacks of

Milliken's **Visa**® TROPICAL

(the original, *proven* 55% Dacron* – 45% worsted blend)

- **Shrugs off wrinkles**
- **Skips pressings**
- **Holds trouser crease – *even in the rain***

Neatest! Coolest! Smartest! Milliken's VISA is the first and best Dacron-Worsted blend. Proven over five summers, Visa is tailored in America's leading brands of men's lightweight suits and slacks. In elegant, year-round Lord West tuxedoes too. Ask for Milliken's VISA by name at your favorite men's store.

For the store nearest you, write:

Milliken Woolens, Inc. Men's Wear Division, 1407 Broadway, New York 18, N. Y.

***DuPont's polyester fiber*